

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16, and 18 are Patentable Over the Cited

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16, and 18 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102(b)) by Davis (U.S. Patent No. 5,657,259). Applicants traverse.

Claims 1, 7, and 13 concern converting in a computer system a text representation of a number into a numeric representation of the number, and requires: converting the text representation of the number into a description of the number's format; mapping the description of the number's format to a sequence of conversion code; and converting the text representation of the number into the numeric representation of the number by use of the sequence of conversion code.

Applicants amended claim 1 to clarify in the preamble that the computer program is executed to perform operations.

The Examiner cited col. 3, lines 50-53, col. 5, lines 48-50, and the TCanonicalNumber of Davis as disclosing the claim requirement of converting the text representation of the number into a description of the number's format. (Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 3 mentions that number formatting classes convert text to a TCanonicalNumber 204 and then uses a TCanonicalNumberFormatter to perform the further conversion to the binary level. The cited col. 5 mentions turning text into a number. Each number formatter attempts to turn text to a number by itself.

Although the cited cols. 3 and 5 discuss converting text to a TCanonicalNumber and text to a number, nowhere has the Examiner cited any part of Davis that discloses converting the text representation of the number into a description of the number's format. The Examiner has not cited any part of Davis that discloses that the TCanonicalNumber comprises a description of the number's format of a text representation of a number as claimed.

Moreover, Davis mentions that the TCanonicalNumber is a "standard intermediate form". (Davis, col. 6, lines 8-12). However, the Examiner has not shown where Davis discloses that this "standard intermediate form" or TCanonicalNumber is a description of the number's format of a text representation of a number.

The Examiner cited col. 3, lines 50-53 and col. 15, lines 41-60 of Davis as disclosing the claim requirement of mapping the description of the number's format to a sequence of conversion code. The Examiner found that Davis teaches converting the TCanonicalNumber through the virtual method TextToCanonicalNumber as teaching this claim requirement. (Office Action, pgs. 3-4) Applicants traverse.

As discussed, the cited col. 3 mentions converting text to a TCanonicalNumber. The Examiner found that the TCanonicalNumber is a description of the number's format. Applicants submit that the Examiner has not cited any part of Davis that discloses that the TCanonicalNumber is a description of a number's format.

Further, the cited col. 3 mentions using a TCanonicalNumberFormatter to perform further conversion to the binary level. Nowhere does this discussion of a number formatter anywhere disclose the claim requirement of mapping the description of the number's format to a sequence of conversion code that then converts the text representation into the numeric representation. Further, the Examiner has not cited any part of Davis that discloses that the cited TCanonicalNumberFormatter converts a text representation of the number into the numeric representation. Instead, the cited col. 3 mentions that the TCanonicalNumberFormatter performs a "further conversion to the binary number." This "further conversion" appears to teach away from converting the text representation into the numeric representation as claimed because, as the Examiner notes, the TCanonicalNumberFormatter converts the TCanonicalNumber, not the text representation as claimed.

The cited col. 15 mentions that developers who write their own TNumberFormat objects will need to write methods to convert text to and from the TCanonicalNumberFormatter format. Nowhere does this cited col. 15 anywhere disclose the claim requirement of mapping the description of the number's format to a sequence of conversion code. Instead, the cited col. 15 mentions that a method converts text to and from the TCanonicalNumberFormatter format. There is no disclosure of mapping a description of the numbers format to a sequence of conversion code as claimed that converts the text representation of the number to the numeric representation as claimed.

The Examiner cited col. 3, lines 50-53, 65-67, col. 4, lines 1-2, col. 5, lines 48-50, and col. 15, lines 54-60 as disclosing the claim requirement of converting the text representation of

the number into the numeric representation of the number by use of the sequence of conversion code. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited sections of Davis discuss how text is converted to a number by converting the text to a TCanonicalNumber and then to a binary level via a TCanonicalNumberFormatter. Nowhere does this cited Davis disclose converting a text representation of a number to a numeric representation by using a sequence of conversion code to which a description of a number's format maps. There is no disclosure in the cited Davis that a description of a number's format maps to the TCanonicalNumberFormatter. Moreover, the claims require that the sequence of conversion code convert the text representation. The cited Davis discusses how the TCanonicalNumberFormatter processes a TCanonicalNumber, not the text representation of the number. Thus, the cited TCanonicalNumberFormatter does not convert the text representation of the number as required.

Accordingly, claims 1, 7, and 13 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Davis does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 16, and 18 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of base claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 4, 10, and 16 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 and further require that the sequence of conversion code for converting the text representation of the number into the numeric representation of the number comprises an assignment statement.

The Examiner cited col. 9, lines 10-62, col. 10, lines 7-22, and col. 15, lines 41-52 of Davis as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 4) The cited cols. 9 and 10 show methods of the TPositionalNumberFormat and TFloatingPointFormat that are used to format a number. However, these cited cols. 9-10 do not disclose that the sequence of conversion code for converting comprises an assignment statement. Instead, the cited cols. 9-10 discuss methods for formatting.

The cited col. 15 also mentions methods to convert text from a TCanonicalNumberFormatter format. Thus, the cited col. 15 methods do not convert a text representation of a number into a numeric representation, but instead convert a TCanonicalNumberFormatter format. Further, nowhere does the cited col. 15 disclose an assignment statement.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 4, 10, and 16 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Davis.

Claims 6, 12, and 18 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 and further require that if the text representation of the number does not convert into the description of the number's format, then not executing the subsequent mapping and converting steps.

The Examiner cited col. 5, lines 48-55 of Davis as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims, finding that Davis teaches not converting the text when the number is out of bounds. (Office Action, pgs. 4-5) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 5 mentions that if the number formatter attempts to turn text to a number by itself, but is unable, it will see what the out of bounds number formatter can do and returns the better match of the two. Nowhere does this cited col. 5 disclose that if the text description does not convert into the description of the number's format is the subsequent mapping and conversion not performed. The cited col. 5 nowhere discloses or mentions failure to convert text into a description of the number's format. Instead, the cited col. 5 mentions that if the attempt to turn text to a number alone fails, then another out of bounds formatter is invoked.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 6, 12, and 18 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Davis.

2. Claims 2, 8, and 14 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 8, and 14 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Davis in view of Turpin (U.S. Patent No. 5,608,898).

Applicants submit that claims 2, 8, and 14 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

3. Claims 3, 9, and 15 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 9, and 15 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Davis in view of Omori (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0086861). Applicants traverse.

Applicants submit that claims 3, 9, and 15 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the additional requirements of these claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art for the following reasons.

Claims 3, 9, and 15 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 and further require that wherein the text representation of the number is converted into a description of the number's format by a translate instruction using a translate table.

The examiner cited pg. 11, para. [0166] of Omori as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 6) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0166] mentions that text data of sequence information on a complete set of DNA can be converted into binary form by using a table. However, the claims require using a translate table to convert a text representation of the number into a description of the number's format. The cited para. [0166] does not teach this additional requirement because para. [0166] discusses converting a text of a DNA sequence into binary form using a table. There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of using a translate table to convert a text representation of the number into a description of the number's format.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 6, 12, and 18 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited combination.

4. Claims 5, 11, and 17 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 11, and 17 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Davis in view of Bratt (U.S. Patent No. 4,525,780). Applicants traverse.

Applicants submit that claims 5, 11, and 17 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the additional requirements of these claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art for the following reasons.

Claims 5, 11, and 17 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 and further require that the mapping of the description of the number's format to a sequence of conversion code comprises mapping the description of the number's format to an index which is used to transfer control to the sequence of conversion code corresponding to the description of the number's format.

The Examiner cited col. 66, lines 30-32 and col. 449, lines 2-7 of Bratt as teaching the claim requirement of mapping to an index. (Office Action, pg. 7) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 66 mentions that a hashing function maps information to index. The cited col. 449 mentions a procedure which takes an index and returns the character string defined for it.

Although the cited Bratt discusses mapping information to an index, the Examiner has not cited any part of Bratt or Davis that teaches or suggests mapping a description of a number's format to an index which is used to transfer control to the sequence of conversion code corresponding to the description of the number's format. Bratt's general discussion of mapping nowhere teaches this specific claimed mapping operation and the Examiner has not cited any part of Davis or other art that teaches the specific claimed mapping operation.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 5, 11, and 17 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited combination.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-18 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for a one-month extension of time. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: June 5, 2006

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984